

Mean-Field and Perturbation Theory of Vortex-like Composite Fermions

Yong-Shi Wu and Yue Yu

Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112

(Received: July 31, 1996)

We develop a field theory for a partially filled Landau level based on composite fermions with a finite vortex core, whose mean-field states are exactly those described by well-tested trial wave functions. Despite non-orthogonality of free composite-fermion states and non-Hermiticity of the mean-field Hamiltonian, a consistent perturbation theory is formulated and the mean-field Fermi sea at half filling is shown to be stable. While the low-energy and long-distance physics is the same as in the Chern-Simons fermion theory, new physics is expected to show up for larger wave vectors.

PACS numbers: 73.40.Hm, 71.10.+x, 71.27.+a, 11.10.Kk.

Physics of interacting planar electrons in a partially filled lowest Landau level (LLL) in a strong magnetic field B is surprisingly rich. For example, at the filling factor $\nu = 1/\tilde{\phi}$, depending on whether $\tilde{\phi}$ is an odd or even integer, the system may be either in an incompressible [1–3] or compressible [4] fluid state, exhibiting the quantized [5] or unquantized [6] Hall effect respectively. The corresponding ground states are known to be described by numerically well-tested *trial* wave functions, such as the Laughlin [1] and Rezayi-Read [7] ones. Physically, these wave functions can be understood in terms of the composite fermion (CF) scenario [8,9]: Namely at fillings near $\nu = 1/\tilde{\phi}$, with $\tilde{\phi}$ even, a quasiparticle is an electron bound to a $\tilde{\phi}$ -fold *vortex* in the electron fluid [10], called a CF, and the strongly correlated fluid itself can be described as a collection of such *weakly interacting* quasiparticles in a *weaker* effective magnetic field $\Delta B = B - B_{\tilde{\phi}}$ with $B_{\tilde{\phi}} \equiv \tilde{\phi} n_e \phi_0$. (Here n_e is the average electron density, ϕ_0 the flux quantum.) For example, if the residue interactions are ignored, the ground state at $\nu = 1/2$ corresponds to a Fermi sea of CF's, while that at $\nu = 1/3$ to a completely filled LLL of CF's in ΔB .

In this Letter, we will report on a local field theoretical approach that allows a systematic improvement of these trial ground states, which are managed to appear as the *mean-field* ground states. Our approach is based on a full realization of the CF scenario, in which the CF has a *finite vortex core*, improving the usual Chern-Simons fermion (CSF) theory [11,4,12] in which an infinitesimally thin $\tilde{\phi}$ -flux is attached to each electron. The inclusion of a finite vortex core is implemented by a *non-unitary* transformation, which makes CF states with definite momenta *non-orthogonal* to each other and the mean-field and perturbed Hamiltonians *non-Hermitian*. Despite these seemingly troublesome features, it is shown possible to formulate a *consistent* perturbation theory, in which the mean-field ground state, a Fermi sea of CF's, at $\nu = 1/\tilde{\phi}$ is perturbatively stable. We have also computed the density-current response functions in the random phase approximation (RPA), and explicitly verified that for small wave vectors they indeed agree with those in the CSF theory [4]. New physics due to the finite vortex core is expected to show up for larger wave vectors.

Generalizing a recent composite-boson construction [13], we introduce the CF field operators by (with $\tilde{\phi}$ even)

$$\Phi(\vec{x}) = e^{-J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x})} \psi(\vec{x}), \quad \Pi(\vec{x}) = \psi^\dagger(\vec{x}) e^{J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x})}, \quad (1)$$

where $\psi(\vec{x})$ is the (spinless) electron field operator, and

$$J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x}) = \tilde{\phi} \int d^2 x' \rho(\vec{x}') \log(z - z') - |z|^2 / 4l_{\tilde{\phi}}^2, \quad (2)$$

with $l_{\tilde{\phi}}$ the magnetic length in $B_{\tilde{\phi}}$ and $z = x + iy$. The usual CSF transform [4] contains only the imaginary part of $\tilde{\phi} \log(z - z')$, which describes the phases due to a vortex with vorticity $\tilde{\phi}$ bound to an electron at z' . We have included the real part too, incorporating a finite vortex core and making the transformation *non-unitary* [14]. Using

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x})} \psi(\vec{x}') &= (z - z')^{\tilde{\phi}} \psi(\vec{x}') e^{-J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x})}, \\ \psi^\dagger(\vec{x}') e^{-J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x})} &= (z - z')^{\tilde{\phi}} e^{-J_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x})} \psi^\dagger(\vec{x}'), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

it is easy to verify $\{\Phi(\vec{x}), \Phi(\vec{x}')\} = \{\Pi(\vec{x}), \Pi(\vec{x}')\} = 0$, and $\{\Phi(\vec{x}), \Pi(\vec{x}')\} = \delta^{(2)}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}')$. Obviously Φ and Π are not Hermitian conjugate: $\Pi = \Phi^\dagger e^{J_{\tilde{\phi}} + J_{\tilde{\phi}}^\dagger}$. Notice that $\rho(\vec{x}) = \psi^\dagger(\vec{x}) \psi(\vec{x}) = \Pi(\vec{x}) \Phi(\vec{x})$ and $[\int d^2 x' \rho, \Pi(\vec{x})] = \Pi(\vec{x})$. Thus the CF density is the same as the electron density, and Π creates a CF while Φ annihilates one.

In terms of CF, the usual electron Hamiltonian reads

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -\frac{1}{2m_b} \int d^2 x \Pi(\vec{x}) (\nabla + i\vec{A} - i\vec{v}_{\tilde{\phi}})^2 \Phi(\vec{x}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int d^2 x d^2 x' \delta\rho(\vec{x}) V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') \delta\rho(\vec{x}'), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where m_b is the electron band mass; $\delta\rho = \Pi\Phi - n_e$, and $\vec{v}_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x}) \equiv i\nabla J_{\tilde{\phi}} = \vec{a}(\vec{x}) + i\hat{n} \times \vec{a}(\vec{x}) - i\vec{x}/2l_{\tilde{\phi}}^2$; $\hat{n}$ is a unit vector perpendicular to the plane and $\vec{a}$ is the usual Chern-Simons gauge field, given by

$$\vec{a}(\vec{x}) = \tilde{\phi} \int d^2 x' \rho(\vec{x}') (\hat{n} \times \vec{x}) / |\vec{x}|^2 \quad (5)$$

in the gauge $\nabla \cdot \vec{a} = 0$, satisfying $b = \nabla \times \vec{a} = 2\pi\tilde{\phi}\rho$. In deriving $\vec{v}_{\tilde{\phi}}$, we have used $\nabla(\text{Re } \log z) = \nabla(\text{Im } \log z) \times \hat{n}$.

The physical justification for including the real part of $\tilde{\phi} \log(z - z')$ in the CF transformation (2) lies in the fact

that the resulting mean-field states give rise to numerically well-tested wave functions. To see this, we note that at the mean field level, one ignores the fluctuations of the Chern-Simons field $\vec{a}$ and, for fillings at or close to $1/\tilde{\phi}$, take $\vec{a}$ to be a classical field determined by eq. (5) with a uniform density n_e , as in CSF theory:

$$\bar{\rho}(\vec{x}) = n_e, \quad \vec{a}(\vec{x}) = (B_{\tilde{\phi}}/2)\hat{n} \times \vec{x} = \vec{A}_{\tilde{\phi}}(\vec{x}). \quad (6)$$

Here one has $\hat{n} \times \vec{a} = \vec{x}/2l_{\tilde{\phi}}^2$, which results in $\bar{J} + \bar{J}^\dagger = 0$. Substituting eq. (6) into eq. (4), we get the mean-field Hamiltonian describing free CF's in an effective field ΔB :

$$H_{MF} = -\frac{1}{2m_b} \int d^2x \Pi(\vec{x})(\nabla + i\Delta\vec{A})^2 \Phi(\vec{x}). \quad (7)$$

Once we get the CF wave function for a mean-field state, $\chi(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_N) \equiv \langle 0 | \Phi(\vec{x}_1) \dots \Phi(\vec{x}_N) | MF \rangle$, the corresponding electron wave function can be easily read off as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{MF}(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_N) &\equiv \langle 0 | \psi(\vec{x}_1) \dots \psi(\vec{x}_N) | MF \rangle \\ &= \langle 0 | e^{J(\vec{x}_1)} \Phi(\vec{x}_1) \dots e^{J(\vec{x}_N)} \Phi(\vec{x}_N) | MF \rangle \\ &= \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^{\tilde{\phi}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4l_{\tilde{\phi}}^2} \sum_i |z_i|^2\right] \chi(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_N), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

recovering Jain's rule for trial wave functions [8]. Here we used the identity (3) to move all $e^{J(\vec{x}_i)}$ to the left, which act on the vacuum $\langle 0 |$ yielding the Gaussian factor. The mean-field CSF theory missed the factor $\prod_{i < j} |z_i - z_j|^{\tilde{\phi}}$, whose presence in eq. (8) is due to the inclusion of the real part of $\tilde{\phi} \log(z - z')$ in our CF transformation (2).

At exactly $\nu = 1/\tilde{\phi}$, CF's are in zero effective magnetic field $\Delta B = 0$. The mean-field Hamiltonian (7) requires the ground state be a filled Fermi sea of CF's, with Fermi wave vector $k_F = (2\pi\tilde{\phi}n_e)^{1/2} = 1/l_{\tilde{\phi}}$. In terms of the CF field in momentum space, the Fermi-sea state ket is

$$|G_0\rangle = \prod_{k < k_F} \Pi(\vec{k}) |0\rangle. \quad (9)$$

Thus, with $\chi_0 = \langle 0 | \Phi(\vec{x}_1) \dots \Phi(\vec{x}_N) | G_0 \rangle = \det(e^{i\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j})$, eq. (8) reproduces the (unprojected) Rezayi-Read trial wave function [7]. According to eq. (7), the mean-field quantum Hall state at $\nu = p/(\tilde{\phi}p + 1)$ is the state with CF's completely filling p Landau levels in ΔB . For $p = 1$,

$$\chi_1(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_N) = \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j) \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4l_{\Delta B}^2} \sum_i |z_i|^2\right]; \quad (10)$$

the mean-field electron wave function (8) just gives the Laughlin trial wave function [1] (since $l_{\tilde{\phi}}^{-2} + l_{\Delta B}^{-2} = l_B^{-2}$)

$$\prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^{\tilde{\phi}+1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4l_B^2} \sum_i |z_i|^2\right]. \quad (11)$$

To systematically improve the mean-field theory, we do perturbation theory to include the effects of fluctuations

of the Chern-Simons field $\vec{a}$. For definiteness, we restrict to the filling $\nu = 1/\tilde{\phi}$, for which $\Delta A = 0$. Instead of eq. (4), we consider the following *Hermitian* Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 + H_1 &= \frac{-1}{2m_b} \int d^2x \Pi(\vec{x}) [\nabla - i(\delta\vec{a} + i\hat{n} \times \delta\vec{a})]^2 \Phi(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8\pi\tilde{\phi}^2} \int d^2x d^2x' \delta b(\vec{x}) V(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') \delta b(\vec{x}'). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with $H_0 = H_{MF}$ and $\delta\vec{a} = \vec{a} - \vec{a}$. We go from the Schrödinger to the interaction picture by a similar but *non-unitary* transformation (H_0 is not Hermitian):

$$|\psi(t)\rangle_I = e^{iH_0 t} |\psi(t)\rangle_S, \quad \hat{O}_I(t) = e^{iH_0 t} \hat{O}_S e^{-iH_0 t}. \quad (13)$$

The CF operators $\Pi_I(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\Phi_I(\vec{x}, t)$ satisfy the usual canonical equal-time anti-commutation relations. The evolution operator, $U(t, t') \equiv e^{iH_0 t} e^{-iH(t-t')} e^{-iH_0 t'}$, is no longer unitary, but we still have $U(t, t) = 1$, and $U(t, t'')U(t'', t') = U(t, t')$, $U^{-1}(t, t') = U(t', t)$. Also the Schrödinger equation and the Dyson formula for $U(t, t')$ are formally the same as before:

$$U(t', t) = T \exp\left(-i \int_t^{t'} d\tau H_1(\tau)\right), \quad (14)$$

where $H_1(t) \equiv e^{iH_0 t} H_1 e^{-iH_0 t}$, and T does time-ordering.

To proceed, first we need an appropriate basis to evaluate the matrix elements of eq. (14). The base kets and bras for CF's with definite momenta [15] are given by

$$|\{\vec{k}_i\}\rangle \equiv \prod_i \Pi(\vec{k}_i) |0\rangle, \quad \langle\{\vec{k}_i\}| \equiv \langle 0 | \prod_i \Phi(\vec{k}_i). \quad (15)$$

They are eigenvectors of H_0 and have orthonormal overlaps. (Note that the bras $\langle\{\vec{k}_i\}|$ do not have orthonormal overlaps with the kets $|\{\vec{k}_j\}\rangle$!) Thus, corresponding to the Fermi-sea ket (9), the bra describing the CF Fermi sea, that has a unit overlap with it, is given by

$$\langle\tilde{G}_0| = \langle 0 | \prod_{k < k_F} \Phi(\vec{k}), \quad \langle\tilde{G}_0|G_0\rangle = 1. \quad (16)$$

Both the ket $|G_0\rangle$ and the bra $\langle\tilde{G}_0|$ are eigenvectors of H_0 with the same energy $\epsilon_0 = \sum_{k < k_F} k^2/2m_b$, while $\langle G_0|$ is not. As a rule, corresponding to usual expectation values in the unperturbed ground state, we always consider the matrix elements between $\langle\tilde{G}_0|$ and $|G_0\rangle$.

The free CF propagator is defined as

$$G_0(\vec{x}, t; \vec{x}', t') = -i \langle\tilde{G}_0| T(\Phi_I(\vec{x}, t) \Pi_I(\vec{x}', t')) |G_0\rangle, \quad (17)$$

whose Fourier transform is the same as a free electron

$$G_0(\vec{k}, \omega) = \frac{\theta(k - k_F)}{\omega - \epsilon_{\vec{k}} + i0^+} + \frac{\theta(k_F - k)}{\omega - \epsilon_{\vec{k}} - i0^+}, \quad (18)$$

where $\theta(k)$ is the step function and $\epsilon_{\vec{k}} = k^2/2m_b$. Introducing a_0 to implement the field-density constraint, a Lagrangian approach for the Chern-Simons propagator

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(\vec{x}, t; 0, 0) = -i\langle \tilde{G}_0 | T(\delta a_\mu(x, t) \delta a_\nu(0, 0)) | G_0 \rangle; \quad (19)$$

leads to the one in usual CSF theory

$$D_{\mu\nu}^0(\vec{q}, \omega) = \delta(\omega) U_{\mu\nu}(\vec{q}), \quad U = \begin{pmatrix} v(\vec{q}) & \frac{2\pi i \tilde{\phi}}{q} \\ -\frac{2\pi i \tilde{\phi}}{q} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Here we have adopted the 2×2 matrix formalism [4] with $\mu, \nu = 0, 1$; 0 stands for the time component, 1 the space component transverse to $\vec{q}$. Eq. (12) implies a *complex* CF-Chern-Simons coupling $\rho \delta a_0 + (\vec{j} - i\hat{n} \times \vec{j}) \cdot \delta \vec{a}$, with $\vec{j} = (-i/2m_b)[(\nabla \Pi) \Phi - \Pi \nabla \Phi]$, resulting in the CF-CF- δa vertex (Fig. 1a)

$$g_\mu(\vec{k} + \vec{q}, \vec{k}) = \left(1, \frac{(\vec{2k} + \vec{q}) \times \hat{q} + i(\vec{2k} + \vec{q}) \cdot \hat{q}}{2m_b} \right), \quad (21)$$

where $\hat{q} = \vec{q}/q$ is a unit vector. Note that the second term in the $\mu = 1$ component is absent in the CSF theory. Moreover, in view of $(\delta \vec{a} + i\hat{n} \times \delta \vec{a})^2 = 0$, there is no CF-CF- δa - δa vertex (Fig. 1b) in our Feynman rules. This makes the structure of Feynman diagrams more like a theory with two-body potential than usual gauge theory.

Using the Wick theorem and the above Feynman rules, one can calculate as usual the matrix elements of the evolution operator (14) between free CF states. To make connection to physics, we have managed to prove a generalized Gell-Mann-Low theorem, which relates these matrix elements to correlation functions:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle G | T O_{1,H}(\vec{x}_1, t_1) \cdots O_{n,H}(\vec{x}_n, t_n) | G \rangle \\ &= \frac{\langle \tilde{G}_0 | T \prod_i O_{i,I}(\vec{x}_i, t_i) U(\infty, -\infty) | G_0 \rangle}{\langle \tilde{G}_0 | U(\infty, -\infty) | G_0 \rangle}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $|G\rangle$ is the true ground state, $O_{i,H}(\vec{x}_i, t_i)$ are local operators in terms of Φ_H and Π_H in the Heisenberg picture. The result, central to our paper, implies a consistent perturbation theory with usual diagrammatic techniques, despite nonunitarity of our CF transformation (1). The proof follows the same steps as in usual many-body perturbation theory [16], but we have to be careful about problems due to non-Hermiticity of H_0 and H_1 .

The basis of the theorem (22) lies in the following lemma: The state obtained from the free CF Fermi-sea $|G_0\rangle$ by adiabatically switching on $H_1(t)$,

$$|G\rangle \equiv C \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0+} \frac{U_\eta(0, -\infty) |G_0\rangle}{\langle \tilde{G}_0 | U_\eta(0, -\infty) | G_0 \rangle} \quad (23)$$

is an eigenstate of $H_0 + H_1$ which, by the adiabatic hypothesis, is assumed to be the true ground state of the system. Here C is a normalization constant and $U_\eta(t, t')$ the operator (14) with $H_1(\tau) \rightarrow e^{-\eta|\tau|} H_1(\tau)$.

To make sense, the limit in the right side of eq. (23) has to exist. We first note that, by purely combinatoric considerations as usual, $U_\eta = U_{\eta L} \exp(U_{\eta 0c})$, where $U_{\eta L}$

is the linked part of U_η , while $U_{\eta 0c}$ the sum of the contributions to $\langle \tilde{G}_0 | U_\eta | G_0 \rangle$ from all unlinked connected diagrams. It can be shown that as $\eta \rightarrow 0+$, $U_{\eta L}(0, -\infty)$ is regular, while $U_{\eta 0c}(0, -\infty)$ diverges as $1/\eta$ due to the integration of $e^{\eta t_i}$ in eq. (14):

$$U_{\eta 0c}(0, -\infty) = iA/\eta + \ln C, \quad (24)$$

where A is η -independent. The potential problem lies in the possibility that A may have a non-zero imaginary part; then the state $U_\eta(0, -\infty) |G_0\rangle$ would have either zero or divergent norm as $\eta \rightarrow 0+$, making the limit in eq. (23) nonsense. Usually U_η is unitary, so A is real. However, this argument does not apply in our case, since our H_1 contains a complex Chern-Simons coupling for CF's. We have managed to check explicitly up to three loops, and to give an argument for any number of loops, that diagram by diagram the contribution to A is real. Thus eq. (24) gives rise to a harmless divergent phase factor to the numerator in eq. (23), that is cancelled by the denominator, and ensures the perturbative stability of the mean-field Fermi-sea ground state $|G_0\rangle$. Moreover, we have been careful to make sure that the usual proof for the state (23) to be an eigenstate of $H_0 + H_1$ goes through in our case: Only the commutation relations are needed here; whether H_0 and H_1 are Hermitian is irrelevant.

Similarly, by adiabatically switching off $H_1(t)$, we get

$$\langle G | \equiv C \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0+} \frac{\langle \tilde{G}_0 | U_\eta(\infty, 0) | G_0 \rangle}{\langle \tilde{G}_0 | U_\eta(\infty, 0) | G_0 \rangle}, \quad (25)$$

and $U_\eta(\infty, -\infty) |G_0\rangle = \exp(i2A/\eta) |G_0\rangle$, again ensuring the perturbative stability of $|G_0\rangle$. With these results, one easily arrives at the generalized Gell-Mann-Low theorem.

In addition to the formal development, we have calculated the density-current response functions, $K_{\mu\nu}(\vec{q}, \omega)$, in the RPA in appropriate limits, to explicitly check that our formalism indeed gives reasonable results. The relevant Feynman diagrams are given in Fig. 2. We note that our Feynman rules, compared to usual CSF theory, have modified the Chern-Simons but not the electromagnetic couplings. Besides, the RPA equation for our $K_{\mu\nu}$ is different from usual CSF theory. Explicit calculations shows that the effects of these two differences cancel for $K_{\mu\nu}$ both in the static ($\omega = 0$) and high-frequency ($\omega \gg qk_F/m_b$) limits for small wavevector $q \ll k_F$. We may summarize the differences between our theory and usual CSF theory by rewriting the RPA equation for our $K_{\mu\nu}$ in the following form:

$$K = K^0 - K^0 [K^0 + \Delta K - U^{-1}]^{-1} K^0, \quad (26)$$

where K^0 is the response function of the noninteracting CF system (see Fig. 2), governed by H_0 ; the matrix ΔK , absent in usual CSF theory, is a diagonal 2×2 matrix

$$\Delta K = \text{diag} \left(0, \hat{K}_{11}^0 - K_{11}^0 - (\hat{K}_{01}^0)^2 / \hat{K}_{00}^0 \right). \quad (27)$$

Here $\hat{K}^0$ is the response function of non-interacting CF's with two Chern-Simons vertices (Fig. 2); in deriving eq. (26) we exploited relations between the explicit expressions of the one-loop blocks in Fig. 2. Straightforward calculation shows that both in the static ($\omega = 0$) and high-frequency ($\omega \gg qk_F/m_b$) limits for small wavevector $q \ll k_F$, ΔK just happens to vanish:

$$\hat{K}_{11}^0 - (\hat{K}_{01}^0)^2 / \hat{K}_{00}^0 = K_{11}^0. \quad (28)$$

Therefore, for long-wavelength fluctuations either in the static or high-frequency limit, there is no physical difference between our theory and CSF theory for the linear-response functions. This provides a consistency check of our perturbation theory: On one hand, the size of the vortex core in a CF is of the order of the magnetic length, so a probe with wavelength much bigger than that should not be able to see the core; on the other hand, the high-frequency behavior of the response function should be constrained by Kohn's theorem [17] (with mass m_b), which is indeed satisfied by our RPA results. Thus, the experimental predictions for probes with long wavelength discussed by Halperin, Lee and Read [4] remain unchanged. Furthermore, when higher-order contributions are included, the "Fermi-liquid corrections" [18] are needed and can be done as well. The details will be given elsewhere [19].

Nevertheless, there is no reason to believe that eq. (28) could be generally true. To uncover the new physics due to the finite vortex core in a CF, which is expected to show up for shorter wavelengths or larger wave vectors, one needs to evaluate the one-loop integrals with parameters in certain intermediate range. Work is in progress.

To conclude, several comments are in order. First, our perturbation formalism can be easily generalized to study the incompressible fractional quantum Hall fluids either from the CF scenario or from the composite boson scenario; in the latter the integer ϕ in eq. (2) is taken to be odd, resulting a canonical boson pair Φ and Π [13]. Here we have considered an infinite, homogeneous system without boundary. It would be interesting to generalize the present formulation to a finite compact geometry, say a sphere or a torus, which may be helpful for clarifying some consequences of the non-orthogonality of CF states, such as fractional and mutual exclusion statistics between quasiholes and quasielectrons [20,21]. Also it is worth to study the effects due to a finite vortex core for quasiparticles on the edge of a finite system with boundary.

Y.S.W. would like to thank F.D.M. Haldane for discussions. The work was supported in part by grant NSF PHY-9309458.

- [5] D.C. Tsui, H.L. Stormer and A.C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559.
- [6] R. L. Willett, J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Stormer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard, and J. H. English, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1776 (1987).
- [7] E.I. Rezayi and N. Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 900 (1994).
- [8] J. K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989); Phys. Rev. **B40**, 8079 (1989); **B41**, 7653 (1990).
- [9] A lucid account is given in N. Read, Semicon. Sci. Tech. **9**, 1859 (1994).
- [10] The vortex interpretation of the Laughlin quasiparticle wave function was noticed, e.g., in F.D.M. Haldane and Y.S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2887 (1985).
- [11] A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. **B44**, 1297 (1991); Phys. Rev. **B47**, 7080 (1993).
- [12] V. Kalmeyer and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **B46**, 9889 (1992).
- [13] R. Rajaraman and S. L. Sondhi, cond-mat/9601125 (to be published).
- [14] A similar, non-unitary transformation has been proposed before at the first-quantized level by M. Ma and F. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1769 (1991).
- [15] In this paper we consider an infinite, homogeneous bulk system without disorder.
- [16] See, e.g., P. Nozières, *Theory of Interacting Fermi Systems*, (W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1964).
- [17] W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1242 (1961).
- [18] A. Stern and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. **B52**, 5890 (1995); S. H. Simon and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. **B50**, 1807 (1994); S. H. Simon, A. Stern and B. I. Halperin, cond-mat/9604103 (to be published).
- [19] Y.S. Wu and Yue Yu, in preparation.
- [20] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 937 (1991).
- [21] Y.S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 922 (1994).

-
- [1] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983);
 - [2] B.I. Halperin, Helv. Phys. Acta **56**, 75 (1983);
 - [3] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 605 (1983).
 - [4] B.I. Halperin, P.A. Lee and N. Read, Phys. Rev. **B47**, 7312 (1993).